

LES SYSTÈMES POLITIQUES DES ÉTATS SOCIALISTES, 2 vols. By *Patrice Gelard*. Paris: Éditions Cujas, 1975. Vol. 1: LE MODÈLE SOVIÉTIQUE. xii, 372 pp. Vol. 2: TRANSPOSITION ET TRANSFORMATIONS DU MODÈLE SOVIÉTIQUE. xxiii, 335 pp. (pp. 373–708). Paper.

The two-volume textbook reviewed here offers a comprehensive view of all socialist political systems adhering to the Marxist-Leninist faith. Thus it treats the USSR, all of Eastern Europe including Albania and Yugoslavia, as well as China, Cuba, North Korea, North Vietnam, and Mongolia, but omits the socialist republics of Africa. Because it was published before the end of the Indochina war, it also fails to consider the changes wrought there since then. Even with these omissions, this is far too large a topic to be treated with any degree of adequacy in 600 or 700 small pages. Hence the books are deplorably superficial. Too many complexities are dismissed in a sentence or two or left out altogether; and many of the brief summaries are so capricious that it might have been better to omit them also.

The author discusses these political systems primarily from the point of view of constitutional law, though he does adduce a bare minimum of historical context and occasional observations about the contrast between legal or institutional fictions and the actual functioning. But there is far too little of such realism; thus the reader learns primarily about the constitutional and legal framework of socialist political systems. This is an arid and fruitless approach which American political scientists abandoned decades ago, having learned from Weber, Marx, and others to suspect this framework as an ideological screen, behind which informal relations of a very different kind go on. These books, therefore, are not likely to find admirers among American students of socialist political systems. Whether they are useful to students restricted to reading French may be doubted as well.

The general tone of this survey tends to be uncritical. While the author expresses his awareness of numerous flaws in socialist systems, on the whole he appears ready to accept much of their own self-image at face value. Thus, he can regard the Stalin constitution of 1936 as a democratization and Westernization of the USSR, justify the purges of the Lenin and Stalin periods, acknowledge the Soviet Union as the "guide and indispensable counselor of all revolutionary movements," and, in little more than a page, suggest, with some reservations, that one-party systems are democratic. Few of his American readers are likely to be convinced. But he is sufficiently critical of the socialist systems that their reviewers will dislike his books also.

The book does supply useful data about the organizational structure of these regimes. It provides the names of those who fill top positions in parties and governments. But this information tends to be out of date as soon as it is printed. Indeed, much of this work already is outdated. Moreover, there are numerous factual and typographical errors, and many faulty transliterations. The book, thin in substance, has been put together sloppily.

ALFRED G. MEYER  
*University of Michigan*

IDEOLOGIEBEGRIFF UND MARXISTISCHE THEORIE: ANSÄTZE ZU EINER IMMANENTEN KRITIK. By *Peter Christian Ludz*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1976. xviii, 337 pp. Paper.

Peter Christian Ludz, professor of political sociology at the University of Munich, has written what he calls "starting points to an immanent critique" of "European Marxism." Some years ago, Herbert Marcuse attempted an "immanent critique" of Soviet Marxism (*Soviet Marxism: A Critical Analysis* [New York, 1958])—that is, he began with the theoretical premises of Soviet Marxism and attempted to develop their

ideological and sociological consequences and reexamine the premises in the light of these consequences. His "critique" allegedly employed the conceptual instruments of its object, namely Marxism, in order to clarify the actual function of Marxism in Soviet society and its historical direction. His approach implied a twofold assumption: that Soviet Marxism (Leninism, Stalinism, and post-Stalin trends) "is not merely an ideology promulgated by the Kremlin in order to rationalize and justify its policies but expresses in various forms the realities of Soviet developments"; and "that identifiable objective trends and tendencies are operative in history which make up the inherent rationality of the historical process."

Marcuse made a mockery of the method of immanent critique not only because the tools forged by his grounding in the "critical theory" of the Frankfurt School were not suited to the task, and because his own political and ideological predilections were too sympathetic to be objective, but primarily because Soviet Marxism, like its Eastern offspring Maoism, is by its very nature inimical to immanent critique. The situation is quite the opposite with Western or "European" Marxism, in which, by its very nature, immanent critique is endemic. Western—essentially Western European—Marxism evolved after the First World War, and after the consolidation of the Russian revolution and Soviet ideology, primarily through the works of Georg Lukács and Karl Korsch, and later through the development of the "Critical theory" of the Frankfurt School. The fundamental tenets were emphasis on the relation between Hegel and Marx and on Marx's "Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts" of 1844, but it has since become associated with a wide variety of theories and opinions. Its significance for scholars concerned with Soviet Marxism is that it throws into high relief not only the wider context of Marxism in the history of Western social thought but also its correspondences with and the deviations from Soviet Marxism in both theory and practice.

Unlike Marcuse, Ludz did not evolve out of the "Frankfurt School," but he is nevertheless representative of the new wave of social and political theorists that matured in postwar Europe. I do not mean to underplay his German orientation—he is today the leading analyst of East German social and political developments—but only to suggest that his course has mirrored the strengths and weaknesses of "European Marxism" in its attempts to respond to the onslaughts of Soviet ideology and power in Europe and the changing nature of Western European and American theory and society. In Ludz's case, he succeeded not only in going beyond the ideological boundaries of Western or "European" Marxism to a conception that in its geographical boundaries encompasses the varieties of Marxist thought in both Western and Eastern Europe, but also has attempted to integrate this broader conception of "European Marxism" into the total complex of Western social and political thought—particularly since the 1920s.

Ludz was one of the first to participate in the postwar Marxist renaissance associated with the "discovery" of Marx's 1844 "Economic-Philosophic Manuscripts," on which he wrote his dissertation. His studies of Lukács in the early 1960s—not included in this collection—were entirely consistent with this quest. The book under review has its origins in preliminary studies undertaken since 1954–55 and contains sixteen articles published in various journals between 1960 and 1975, including two previously unpublished articles. The ordering of their inclusion is somewhat arbitrary; the basic division is between theoretical investigations in the first half and their application to empirical circumstances—particularly in the German Democratic Republic—in the second half. A list of the chronological order of the years in which each article was published appears at the end and for this reviewer it is more instructive to read the articles in the order in which they were written because they evidence the attempts of one of Europe's leading political sociologists to assimilate and integrate the major postwar West European and American trends of sociological and systems theory into

“European Marxism” and to relate this complex to and contrast it with ideological and sociological trends in Eastern European and Soviet Marxism. The author’s stated intentions reflect both the present state of European social thought and his own concerns. He attempts to investigate systematically certain perspectives of the sociology of knowledge and the critique of ideology in connection with a historically and sociologically oriented functionalism, and this from a “metatheoretical” standpoint. In so doing he seeks to place the thesis of the historico-sociological conditioning of theoretical constructions on a more precise basis than the earlier formulations of the sociology of knowledge and to lay new foundations for historical convergences through positive research. From this standpoint the author also seeks to bridge the chasm between normative-prescriptive and empirical-descriptive research methods in the social sciences.

These collected articles are considered by the author as “material” for a “metatheory” of the concept of ideology—“metatheory” conceived in this sense as “the systematic theoretical joining of the epistemological and categorical levels of the concept of ideology as well as their conversion into programs for research. They are “prolegomena” for three projects: (1) a comparative study of “political secret societies” in terms of the relation between ideology, utopia, organization, and the social variants of ideology; (2) an analysis of “European Marxism” and those facets and nuances which converge with and overlap the Marxian and post-Marxian theories of ideology in the light of East-West conflicts, the perspective of political science, and the critique of ideology in their (meta)theoretical structures; and (3) the systematic consideration of one of the more refined frameworks of functionalism—in terms of epistemology, historical sociology, and empirical sociology. Most important in the first regard is his essay, “Ideology, Intellectuals, and Organization: Remarks Concerning their Interrelation in Early Bourgeois Society”; in the second, his essays entitled “The Concept of Structure in the Marxist Theory of Society” and “Approaches to Conflict Theory in Historical Materialism”; in the third, his introductory essay, “Ideology and the Concept of Ideology.”

Ludz succeeds where Marcuse failed in the utilization of the method of immanent critique, but in so doing he points up the epistemological and ontological limitations of “European Marxism” (both ideologically and geographically), the concept of ideology, and such current social science approaches as functionalism in dealing with social and political reality as Marx conceived it. Perhaps the main weakness of post-war “European Marxism” (excluding such thinkers as Eric Hobsbawm and Louis Althusser, who ideologically are more kin to Soviet Marxism) is that it has abandoned Marxism as a “science of society” to official Communist Marxists. In so doing, it deals with aspects of society and history rather than with their totality. Moreover, the category of economics in general and the mode of production in particular has virtually disappeared from view and has been replaced by considerations of alienation, dialectics, reification, and so forth. The emphasis on the concept of ideology and Marxist theory in Ludz’s work owes as much to European social thought since the 1920s (for example, Mannheim’s *Ideology and Utopia*) as it does to the fact that official Communist theoreticians have made an ideology out of the science of society. Likewise, the nature of his immanent critique owes as much to trends in Western European and American sociological theory, in particular functionalism, as to the constantly changing nature of “European Marxism.” In designating his approach “metatheoretical” Ludz acknowledges that (similar to Gerard Radnitzky’s work, *Contemporary Schools of Metascience*) he is concerned primarily with contemporary schools or models of a “hermeneutic” and “dialectical” tradition which study and philosophize about theories and which attempt to utilize them as research guides. The method is by its very nature open-ended rather than definitive, but the primacy of functionalism in Ludz’s investigations, as well as in present-day sociological theory (both normative

and empirical), almost assumes the character of a fetish and mitigates against efforts at a "positive critique" of ideology. Such a critique can only be based on what Marx called "positive knowledge," and this not about the "superstructure" but about the "infrastructure." From the standpoint of the science of society, Ludz's approach begs the political and institutional questions of the totality of Marx's approach to history. But from the standpoint of the sociology of knowledge, his "starting points to an immanent critique" of the concept of ideology and Marxist theory are a major contribution.

G. L. ULMEN  
New York

THE STRUCTURE OF ECONOMIC SYSTEMS. By *John Michael Montias*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1976. xii, 323 pp.

Comparers of economic systems—and which of us is not?—will benefit from this pioneering treatise. Its impact on fellow specialists should be immediate. Later on, as its insights shape the efforts of economists, political scientists, and historians to evaluate economic systems, all will gain. The author's heroic objective is to define and apply criteria and measures of system performance that will be independent of the systems themselves. To this end he draws on information theory and the theory of organizations in order to augment the narrow framework of contemporary economic theory. His results are exploratory rather than definitive. This is the work of a thoughtful and conscientious scholar surveying the tasks involved, proposing analytic approaches, and recognizing inherent difficulties. It is a challenge to further work.

The two chapters of part 1 define some basic concepts and lay out an analytic framework. Part 2 contains three chapters: "system structure and normed outcomes," "common desiderata and efficiency," and "from theory to measurement." Here Montias presents methodological suggestions and cautious observations on the work of others relating to the macroeconomics of the comparison of systems. Part 3 deals with microcomparisons involving the elements of system description. Its five chapters discuss more detailed aspects of economic operations: consumption and distribution, technologies utilized, forms of interactions among participants, ownership and custody, and competitive processes. The four chapters in part 4 on organizations, hierarchies, and associations take up issues of incentives, power, autonomy, and decentralization. The three chapters of part 5 discuss the goals of producing enterprises and their consequences for an economic system. A concluding chapter reflects on fruitful directions for further research.

The author is as broad as his subject. While much of his analysis focuses on the USSR, there is considerable attention to Eastern and Western Europe and some reference to Japan and China. In previous research Montias has given as painstaking analyses of the Polish and Rumanian economies as well as stimulating appreciations of the forces at work in Eastern Europe. His interests range from the fine arts and linguistics to mathematics and economic theory. This breadth of mind and range of coverage is both essential for the task in hand and a frustrater of neat conclusions.

Montias draws on a wide range of materials. His well-selected references will assist anyone pursuing the issues he discusses. Relevant recent additions to his list might include the work of David Granick on Eastern European management, *Quantitative Economic Policy and Planning* by Nicolas Spulber and Ira Horowitz (Norton, 1976), and Vaclav Holesovsky's *Economic Systems: Analysis and Comparisons* (McGraw-Hill, 1977). On the economics of bureaucracies, some readers will find the work of William Niskanen and others useful. Technicians should weigh the applicability of fuzzy set theory (see for example, C. V. Negoita and M. Sularia, "On Fuzzy Mathe-